

REMARKS

Claim Objections:

The most recent Office Action objects to claim 4 as reciting “the portion” and “the second portion.” In response, Applicant respectfully submits that this is a correct recitation, with support for “the portion,” i.e., “a portion,” being found in line 5 of claim 1.

The Office Action object to claims 19 and 59 as omitting the transitional term. Applicant has corrected this inadvertent typographical error by amendment herein.

Claim Amendments:

Independent claims 1, 19, 37, 55, 59, and 63 have been amended to recite precluding compression of portions of the first image that are complementary to the portion being compressed. Support for the amendment is found in Applicant’s specification, as published, at least at page [0083].

Claim Rejections under 35 USC §103:

The Office Action rejects claims 1-66 under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious in view of Gordon et al., US Published Patent Application No. 2003/0028879, hereinafter “Gordon,” in view of Nadan, US Pat. No. 5,321,750, further in view of Plotnick et al., US Pat. No. 7,440,674, hereinafter “Plotnick.” Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Using claim 1 as an example, this claim as amended recites, *inter alia*, “...forming a first compressed image [received as an analog signal and converted to a digital image] from a portion of a first image area by representing at least one segment of the first image within the portion with a reference to another segment of the first image within the portion and precluding compression of portions of the first image complementary to the portion...” Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Gordon, Nadan, and Plotnick fails to make known or obvious the claimed compression occurring from a portion of an image with the remainder of the image being precluded from compression. To the contrary, the combination of Gordon, Nadan, and Plotnick teaches compression of entire images without any preclusion of compression whatsoever.

Beginning with Gordon, Gordon teaches encoding an entire image without any preclusion. See, e.g., Gordon at paragraph [0070]. While portions of Gordon's images can be encoded separately, e.g., a video portion and a grid portion, for optimization "to best encode the associated portion," it is clear from Gordon's disclosure that the entire image is encoded. Gordon at paragraph [0050]. See also Gordon at paragraph [0088].

Nadan teaches encoding complete images as well. In Nadan, the encoder (312) receives video signals (Nadan, col. 38, lines 30-33) and fully encodes each frame. While image updates can be based upon "pixel change data," the changes are determined from fully encoded images. Nadan, col. 46, lines 28-50 and col. 47, lines 44-58. While tiles can be used to create layered images, each tile is fully encoded. Nadan, col. 57, lines 10-22. Thus, when Nadan is combined with Gordon, each image is fully encoded.

Plotnick teaches a method of presenting trick advertising to a viewer in one portion of the screen. Plotnick, col. 4, lines 25-31. However, the trick advertisements are fully compressed files. See, e.g., Plotnick at col. 21, lines 52-57. The video onto which they are superimposed are also compressed. See, e.g., Plotnick at col. 28, lines 24-48. Accordingly, when Plotnick is combined with Gordon and Nadan, fully compressed images can be superimposed to form a picture-in-picture appearance. This is not unlike the tiling process occurring in Nadan. As described in several previous responses, superimposing or tiling is distinct and different from Applicant's claimed method.


Applicant has searched the specification of each of the references, including the portions relied upon by the Examiner, and is unable to find any teaching whatsoever of forming a compressed image for integration into a second image, where the first image is formed from compressing only a portion of that image and precluding compression of all portions complementary to the portion of interest.

As none of the references, alone or in combination, make known or obvious each and every limitation of Applicant's claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits the rejection is overcome in view of the amendment and these comments. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the same. As each independent claim recites a limitation similar to claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-66 are in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

For the above reasons, Applicant believes the specification and claims are now in proper form, and that the claims all define patentably over the prior art. Applicant believes this application is now in condition for allowance, for which they respectfully submit.

Respectfully submitted,



Philip H. Burrus, IV
Attorney for Applicant

Registration No.: 45,432

404-797-8111

404-880-9912 (fax)

pburrus@burrusiplaw.com